



INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
302 W. WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE E-306
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204-2764

<http://www.state.in.us/iurc/>
Office: (317) 232-2701
Facsimile: (317) 232-6758

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMMISSION)
INVESTIGATION AND GENERIC PROCEEDING)
OF RATES AND UNBUNDLED NETWORK)
ELEMENTS AND COLLOCATION FOR INDIANA)
BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, INCORPORATED)
d/b/a SBC INDIANA PURSUANT TO THE)
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 AND)
RELATED INDIANA STATUTES)

FILED
CAUSE NO. 42393
DEC 04 2003

INDIANA UTILITY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

You are hereby notified that on this date the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") makes the following Entry in this Cause:

The Commission held a Technical Conference on December 2, 2003, to discuss the differences in the parties' rates when calculating the nonrecurring costs for the second set of scenarios. Many disputes were resolved in the Technical Conference. The parties, however, requested answers to three clarifying questions. The answers to those questions are provided in the attachment (Attachment 1) to this Entry.

The Commission also requests responses to the following two additional scenarios.

Scenario 9: Using Scenario 6, modify the copper distribution fill to 52.5%.

Scenario 10: Using Scenario 6, modify the copper distribution fill to the average of SBC's Actual Fill and SBC's 1/99 ACAR Fill.


On or before December 12, 2003, the parties should file an Excel spreadsheet with the services and the final UNE rates (recurring and nonrecurring charges) for all ten scenarios issued to date, SBC's proposed price list, and each CLEC's proposed price list. For reference, see SBC Indiana's Submission of Recalculated UNE Rates filed on November 21, 2003. Please indicate the percentage of shared and common costs used to calculate the final UNE rates.

As with other scenario responses the parties have provided, responses will be used to ascertain the effect of a comprehensive change in many inputs, and are not necessarily reflective of any final Commission determination.


If you have any questions regarding the scenarios, please e-mail Joel Fishkin using the Commission e-mail distribution list provided in this Cause, with e-mail copies

to all parties as has been done in other electronic communications in this Cause. Commission responses to questions about the scenarios will, likewise, be sent electronically to all parties.


IT IS SO ORDERED.




Larry S. Lands, Commissioner



William G. Divine, Administrative Law Judge



Date



Nancy E. Manley, Secretary to the Commission

Attachment 1

Responses to NRC Workshop Follow-Up Questions

1. Should Service Order Computer Processing Costs be explicitly incorporated into recurring costs? If so, how?

Service Order Computer Processing Costs from the nonrecurring cost study should be incorporated into recurring costs. Specifically, parties should recalculate the shared and common cost factor to include the Service Order Computer Processing Costs from the nonrecurring cost study. For reference see testimony of Starkey/Fischer, pp. 105-107.

2. Should SBC's cross-connect time in its original study be assumed to be based on a 100 percent inclusion of IDF or a 32.14 percent inclusion of IDF?

SBC's cross-connect time in its original cost study should be based on 32.14 percent inclusion of IDF.

3. Should the DID Trunk Port Additional, ISDN Prime Trunk Port Add/Rearrange Additional, and DID Trunk Port Add/Rearrange Additional elements use the task list that SBC identified for an *initial* provisioning of these elements or use the subset of tasks Mr. Turner identified for an *additional* provisioning of these elements?

The DID Trunk Port Additional, ISDN Prime Trunk Port Add/Rearrange Additional, and DID Trunk Port Add/Rearrange Additional elements should use the task list that Mr. Turner identified for an additional provisioning of these elements.